

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,832	02/01/2006	Wataru Takahashi	39626	8007
52054 PEARNE & GO	7590 12/10/200 ORDON LLP	7	EXAMINER	
1801 EAST 9T	H STREET	KERNS, KEVIN P		
SUITE 1200 CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/10/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patdocket@pearne.com dchervenak@pearne.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/566,832	TAKAHASHI ET AL.	TAKAHASHI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Kevin P. Kerns	1793		

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the co	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>29 November 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of A this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affic places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in coa Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be considered.	davit, or other evidence, which ompliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3)
time periods: a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires <u>5</u> months from the mailing date of the linar rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in	the final rejection, whichever is later. In
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	date of the final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply origin set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	f the fee. The appropriate extension fee ally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)). 	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since
a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 AMENDMENTS	7 CFR 41.37(a).
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, to	will not be entered because
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOT	
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially red appeal; and/or	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	11 1 A 1 1 (DTO) 204
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Con	npliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, ti 	imply filed amondment canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	•
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	be entered and an explanation of
Claim(s) objected to:	
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Not because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	t or other evidence is necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the centered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. \square The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after en	
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in	condition for allowance because
See Continuation Sheet.	
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).	
13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	
	Kevin P. Kerns Kenn Kenns 17/1/07 Primary Examiner
	Art Unit: 1793

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the applicants' remarks/arguments on pages 3 and 4 of the after final amendment/response remain unpersuasive for the same reasons set forth in sections 4 and 6 of the final rejection mailed September 20, 2007. In addition, the applicants argue that there would be a distinction between "within the robot main body" and "in the robot main body driving power cable", and the examiner agrees with the merits of this statement. However, the applicants make the remark in the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4 of the remarks/arguments (with reference to page 6, lines 3-5 of the final rejection) that the examiner has not set forth a proper response to this limitation in the 35 USC 103(a) rejections and Response to Arguments (in sections 4 and 6, respectively) of the final rejection. The examiner respectfully disagrees, as in the middle of page 6 of the final rejection the examiner states, "Regarding the features disclosed by Nishimura, Nishimura discloses a power cable 3 and many control cables 4 (inclusive of motion detectors/sensors for robot joint and wire feeder motors)". In response to this argument, not only are cables 3 and 4 within the robot main body (and overcome the deficiencies of the applicants' admitted prior art (AAPA)), but also these cables are both accommodated in the "robot main body driving power cable". As a result (and as shown in Figure 1), these cables would necessarily be used together, as they both provide a "driving power" to various portions throughout the arc welding robot, including those portions extending to the welding torch itself (also see complete translation of the Japanese document). Importantly, there is sufficient motivation to combine the references, as set forth in section 6 of the final rejection. As a result, claims 1-4 remain rejected.

Continuation of 13. Other: the prior objections to the drawings have been overcome by the applicants' amendments to the specification in the present amendment, and will be entered (as indicated in above section 7b) to place the application in better form for appeal.

KEVIN KERNS Kein Keme 12/1/07 PRIMARY EXAMINER